



STANFORD UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305 • (415) 321-1200

STANFORD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE  
Department of Genetics

AUG 18 1970

Dear Dr, Scoville

Thank you for the CW material.

I am almost convinced by the "No Gas, Period" reasoning; as you might have seen in the dialogue with Han Swyter at the Zablocki Committee hearings. My concern is that a wall that far out may be ~~xxxx~~ hard to maintain, and we ought to have some intermediate positions ready too. What if Algeria claims that our domestic use of tear gas, anent a race riot, is really an act of chemical warfare, and asserts that we have abrogated a CW convention. A bloc could then have a claim to being no longer bound by any part of it, the more to embarrass our own people.

Also, the UK proposals on production (beyond use) of chemicals will have insurmountable difficulties unless we find some other line between nerve gas and domestic products.

- - - -

I was impressed at the CCD by the complexity of various proposals, and my ability to think up many new permutations of equally dubious merit. I recalled your testimony about "gaming" diplomacy, and want to ask now if you can refer me to more details on it. I have a fair bit of experience with computer intelligence of hypotheses in chemistry, and have wondered if we could extend that approach to diplomacy. I do not put much stock in a computer simulation of the actual negotiations or their strategic implications in the real world-- I've bloodied my head trying to deal with many far simpler challenges. But I did think it might be possible to generate and amplify a useful taxonomy of proposals that at least might help assure one that he had covered the ground of possible approaches.

Can you give me any further leads on the U/Pa game, or any other relevant literature?\*

Sincerely,

Joshua Lederberg

\*on useful or interesting  
simulations of bargaining  
at all strategic level.